1:Arensberg & Kimball E-5 (1932-1934) 1940
ER6 Rural Irish ER6
County Clare

the money in a will, but insisted the son pay for the land. 428
After that, there was a cow and a calf left over, which he 763
reserved for himself. When he called in a solicitor to make another will disposing of the cow and calf, this time, as he lay dying in the County Home, the nun in charge said he had been awake all night mumbling to himself about the cow and calf. The solicitor and the nun finally got him to leave the money for masses.

These cases show the hold of the pattern of receiving 428
money for the transfer of family property. It must be understood that under ordinary circumstances the payment the son had to make would be devoted to the other children, as is the dowry. But in these cases the pattern persisted though there were no other children.

Another case occurred in which a farmer named Patrick [429]
N— left money, farm, and everything he had to his nephew Michael in trusteeship to be given to him upon his marriage with the trustee's approval. Here no money was demanded, but another common feature of countrymen's wills was involved which throws light on the general family situation. The old man had other nephews who had given him a hand from time to time in fulfillment of the agricultural pattern. By mischance they discovered the content of the will, called their uncle an "old fraud" and a "robber," and stopped working for him. A generous move on the part of Michael prevented further bad blood.

English law of property gives the owner full right to dispose at will of farm and other real property as personal chattels. That right is, of course, embodied in Irish legal practice. But the situation underlying the Irish farm life is otherwise. In the first cases cited, we see a tendency to enforce payment for the farm, analogous to the dowry. In the last case, the basis for that tendency is the expectation of provision on the part of the family members. With the transfer of the farm and the break of the family at either